



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Luciani quae fertur Demosthenis Laudatio; Recensuit et illustravit FERDINANDUS ALBERS. Lipsiae: in aedibus B. G. Teubneri, MCMX (pp. 76).

This dissertation begins with an examination of the codices in the effort to establish the text on a more authoritative basis. Anticipating his conclusion that the *Encomium* was not written by Lucian, Albers examines as criteria the evidences of the rhetorician's art; the persons, scene, and time of the dialogue; the peculiarities of the Greek; stylistic questions such as the avoidance of hiatus; and the sources for the subject-matter. He then deals with the question of the authorship. Then follows the Greek text with critical notes and a commentary.

Albers assumes that this dialogue is now universally ("nunc inter omnes constat," p. 38) considered spurious. This is hardly a correct statement. It is accepted as genuine in the Teubner text (1887) and by those who follow it. Thus the Fowlers in their translation (1905) include it by virtue of its apparent Lucianic qualities, and dissent expressly from the high authority of Croiset whom they generally follow. On grounds of the rhetorical coloring and sophistic method and the peculiarities of diction common to the second Christian century—whether in the way of successful, though over-careful, Atticizing or of actual slips in Attic usage—Albers makes out a case for the possibility of authorship by some rhetorician of the period other than Lucian.

If the dialogue was composed at Alexandria, as Albers plausibly argues, this might be a contributory reason for rejecting Lucian's authorship, as we have no specific grounds for believing that Lucian was settled in Egypt in his earlier years and certain peculiarities seem inconsistent with his authorship unless the dialogue be referred, as has been suggested by others, to his *juvenilia*.

As the unknown author himself lays stress on the novelty, not of the subject-matter, but of the use of dialogue as a vehicle for an encomium, Albers, assuming that it was not by Lucian, concludes that it could not have been written until after 162 A.D., when Lucian had furnished, in his *Imagines*, a model for this new departure in literature. He therefore contents himself with assigning as time limits for the composition the years between 162 and 272 A.D., that is, before the destruction by Aurelian of the Bruchion in Alexandria, to which building, as he argues, reference is made in *Encom.* 2.

While admitting the full value of all the criteria discussed in this and similar dissertations, it may not be captious to urge that after these important data are established there is still demanded of the critic an attempt to estimate the more elusive but real Lucianic flavor. Albers, for example, cites among other instances of sophistic reminiscence of the great Greek authors two passages recalling Plato's *Republic* (*Rep.* 344, *d*, and 476, *b*) but although he has just said: "non solum singula verba sed etiam totas sententias deprompsit," he confines his attention to the mere citing of one or

two Platonic words. Yet the context is redolent of that larger Platonic reminiscence in which Lucian was so apt to indulge. In this second passage (*Encom.* 18), indeed, there is still a third and obvious allusion to the *Republic* (354 b) where Socrates humorously complains that he has been distracted, like gourmands at a feast, from one intellectual dish to another. The "classics" were not, to be sure, unknown to other *littérateurs* of this second century, but this whole passage is so characteristic of the versatile Syrian, "drawing his honey from here and yon in the Platonic meadow"—not contenting himself with a bald, long-winded citation such as he delights to criticize in others—that it might seem desirable to pass in review the remainder of the dialogue before deciding that this *Encomium* is less Lucianic than some other pieces included among his less famous but acknowledged writings.

FRANCIS G. ALLINSON

Thesaurus linguae Latinae epigraphicae: A Dictionary of the Latin Inscriptions. By GEORGE N. OLCOTT. Rome: Loescher & Co.; New York: Lemecke & Buechner. Vol. I, fasc. 16 (*Apis-Apul*), 1910; fasc. 17-20 (*Apul-Arne*), 1911; fasc. 21 (*Arne-Aser*), 1912. Each fasc., \$0.50.

These are the last completed fascicules which Dr. Olcott was permitted to see published before his untimely and sudden death from pneumonia on March 2, 1912, in Rome, where he was spending the year at work upon his Dictionary. The first foglio (8 pages) of fascicule 22 was in print and proofs of the second foglio were in his hands before his illness; during the year he planned to complete the letter A and to finish collecting material for the letters B-F.

The standard of excellence, which is set in the earlier fascicules, is maintained throughout these last ones. The small part of the Dictionary already completed is itself a monument to Dr. Olcott's patient accuracy and an honor to American scholarship. As the present writer has testified in earlier reviews of the work in this journal, the Dictionary is much more than a mere lexicon or list of words arranged alphabetically. Meanings of words are distinguished and usages classified and one has at hand all the inscriptional evidence, for example, under *ara*, *arcus*, *area* for the student of topography, under *Apollo*, *Apollinaris* for the student of religion, under *argentarius* for the student of private life, and so on.

It would be most unfortunate, if the work of compiling this Dictionary, so well inaugurated by Dr. Olcott, should now be indefinitely suspended. Some way should be found by which the task of completing it may be immediately undertaken by a collaborating editorial board of American scholars. There is urgent need of such a Dictionary of Latin Inscriptions and the work should proceed at least as fast as the Munich *Latin Thesaurus*.

WALTER DENNISON